



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,150	11/18/1999	REINER KRAFT	AM9-99-0095	5474

48146 7590 03/28/2005  
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

PARTON, KEVIN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/442,150	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KRAFT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kevin Parton	<b>Art Unit</b> 2153	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*TL*

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1-9 and 22-33 is withdrawn in view of the new grounds of rejection below. The After Final Amendment has been entered and the newly amended claims are considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the

application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2). This particular case was filed before 11/29/1999.

4. Regarding claim 1, Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) teach a system for processing search results obtained in a response to a user query with means for:

- a. Providing document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (column 6, lines 20-28; figure 9)
- b. Generating a visual abstract for at least one of the documents, the visual abstract being a thumbnail image (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).
- c. Formatting a stream of data such that when the data is displayed on a display screen regarding the at least one of the documents, one of the visual abstracts appears adjacent to a corresponding search result (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).

Although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein two

visual abstracts are created for each of the documents, the two thumbnail images being of a different size.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by creating visual abstracts of varying sizes. This benefits the system by allowing users to view a larger abstract when the smaller one is not sufficient for determining the validity of the result.

5. Claims 2-9 and 11-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) in view of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

6. Regarding claim 2, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the visual abstract is generated after first manipulating the document so as to enhance a visibility of at least a portion of the document.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) as evidenced by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

In an analogous art, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) discloses a system for search and the presentation of results wherein the visual abstract is generated after first manipulating the document so as to enhance a visibility of at least a portion of the document (figure 4).

Given the teaching of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by enhancing a portion of the visual abstract. This would benefit the user by allowing for the immediate identification of the search result without having to click through to the page itself. Without a title or other larger identifying marking, the search result may be rendered useless to the requestor.

7. Regarding claims 3, 4, and 18, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the manipulating is performed by filtering the document and the filtering is performed on an image in the document.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) as evidenced by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

In an analogous art, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) discloses a system for search and the presentation of results wherein the manipulating is performed by filtering the document the manipulating is performed by filtering the document (figure 4). Please note that images are filtered out in the reference.

Given the teaching of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by filtering the document for manipulation

such as increasing the size of a title. This benefits the system as shown above in regards to claim 2.

8. Regarding claims 5-9, 12-16, 25-27, 32, and 33, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claims 1, 11) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for the following:

- a. Displaying a larger one of the visual abstracts on the display screen when requested by the user.
- b. Storing data relating to the larger one of the visual abstracts
- c. Wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is displayed on the display screen when a cursor is moved over the smaller one of the visual abstracts.
- d. Removing the larger one of the visual abstracts from the display screen when the cursor is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by storing it and displaying it to the user when the cursor is passed over the smaller abstract. This is commonly done in the art in a wide range of situations and benefits the system by allowing a user to get a better view of the search result without accessing and downloading the page.

9. Claim 11 contains all of the same limitations present in claim 1. It further provides means for obtaining the documents from the source. Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) teaches this in figure 6, element 610).

Although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for ensuring that a title of the document is readable on each thumbnail image.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) as evidenced by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

Given the teaching of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by ensuring that a title of a document can be read. This benefits the system by making the visual abstracts useful to the requestor. Without a readable title, some of the abstracts would provide no useable information.

10. Claim 17 contains all of the same limitations taught by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) present in claim 11. The claim further teaches means for determining whether a portion of a source document should be enhanced for visibility relative to another portion and manipulating the source document determined to have a portion to be enhanced so that one portion therein is manipulated to improve a visibility while another portion therein is manipulated to degrade a visibility, wherein the manipulating includes filtering the source document.



Although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for determining whether a portion of a source document should be enhanced for visibility relative to another portion and manipulating the source document determined to have a portion to be enhanced so that one portion therein is manipulated to improve a visibility while another portion therein is manipulated to degrade a visibility, wherein the manipulating includes filtering the source document.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) as evidenced by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

In an analogous art, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) discloses a system for providing search results with means for determining whether a portion of a source document should be enhanced for visibility relative to another portion and manipulating the source document determined to have a portion to be enhanced so that one portion therein is manipulated to improve a visibility while another portion therein is manipulated to degrade a visibility, wherein the manipulating includes filtering the source document (figure 4).

Given the teaching of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by improving the visibility of a portion of the document by utilizing a filter. This would benefit the user by allowing for the immediate identification of the search result without having to click through to the

page itself. Without a title or other larger identifying marking, the search result may be rendered useless to the requestor.

11. Regarding claims 19-21 and 24, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claims 17, 22) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the portion of the source document to be enhanced corresponds to at least one of a title and a heading of the source document, one of the title and heading is enlarged as compared with a second portion of the source document and wherein the second portion of the source document corresponds to a body of text of the source document.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) as evidenced by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

In an analogous art, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) discloses a system for providing search results wherein the portion of the source document to be enhanced corresponds to at least one of a title and a heading of the source document, one of the title and heading is enlarged as compared with a second portion of the source document and wherein the second portion of the source document corresponds to a body of text of the source document (figure 4).

Given the teaching of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by making the title or heading of a search result larger in relation to the body text of the document. This benefits the

user by allowing for the immediate identification of the search result without having to click through to the page itself. Without a title or other larger identifying marking, the search result may be rendered useless to the requestor.

12. Claims 22, 29, and 30 provide limitations rejected above in regards to claim 1. Please refer to the rejection of claim 1.

13. Regarding claims 23 and 31, please see the rejection of claim 17 above.

14. Regarding claim 28, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claim 27) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for deleting the data relating to the second visual abstract in the cache database after a predetermined amount of time.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by deleting a stored larger abstract from the cache after a predetermined amount of time. This benefits the system by decreasing the burden of memory required to store the large number of images that may result over a period of searching. This is well known in the art and commonly applied in Internet access applications.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (571)272-3958. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

Art Unit: 2153

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Parton  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2153

ksp



**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**